

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-10, 16-18, 20-21, 25-30 and 33-34 are currently pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 16 and 28 and have cancelled claims 5, 7-8, 11-14, 19, 22-24 and 31-32.

In the Office Action, claims 16, 22, 24, 27, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0013163 to O'Prey. Applicant has amended independent claims 16 and has cancelled, without prejudice, claims 22 and 24. Claims 38 and 39 were cancelled previously. The present invention as claimed in amended independent claim 16 is directed to a wireless communication unit that reformats dialed numbers according to the dialing plans from any of a plurality of different communication networks where the reformatted dialed number corresponds to the format of the dialing plan of a selected network and where the selected network is determined according to the network within which the communication unit is located. No new matter is added by way of the amendment, and support for the amendment is found throughout the Specification including page 11, lines 9-17. As is described, the communication unit selects a communication network according to the network within which it is located, such as a WLAN or a WAN. Once the communication network is selected, the call is formatted according to the dialing plan that corresponds to that network. See page 12, lines 7-12.

O'Prey is not directed to reformatting dialed numbers based on the selected communication network where the selected network is determined by the location of the wireless communication network. O'Prey modifies dialed numbers, but the modification is not related to the location of the communication unit and dialing plan of the communication network selected by the communication unit to make the call to the target unit. Rather, O'Prey modifies the number by adding and removing prefixes to numbers to accommodate routing calls through a routing switch. In particular, paragraphs [0035]-[0037], cited in the Office Action focuses on the routing of a call through a network where the routing is based on the costs of the call to the target unit. The route can be determined by the SIM card or by another device. The communication network is not

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

selected according to the location of the communication unit and selected the communication network from the plurality of communication networks available at that location. O'Prey does not discuss the use of different dialing plans based on different communication networks available at a location. It is therefore respectfully submitted that O'Prey does not disclose and therefore does not anticipate the present invention as found in claim 16. As claim 27 depends upon and includes each and every limitation of claim 16, it is also respectfully submitted that this dependent claim is not anticipated by O'Prey. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of United States Patent No. 5,963,863 to Berggren and United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0043613 to Phillips. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 28 to further define the invention over the cited references and have cancelled claims 5, 8, 11-15, 31 and 35-37. As with claim 16, Applicants direct claims 1 and 28 to the obtaining the reformatting rules based on dialing plan of the selected communication network used to call the target unit where the selected communication network is selected by determining within which communication network the communication unit is located. As discussed above, O'Prey does not reveal determining a communication network from a plurality of available communication networks from the location of the communication unit. Phillips is used to support the idea of rules based implementation for translating or reformatting a dialed string. Berggren is used to support that the communication unit can communication in both a WLAN and a WAN. Regardless neither Berggren nor Phillips discuss the reformatting the number based on dialing plan of the selected communication network used to call the target unit and the communication network is selected by determining within which communication network the communication unit is located. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of O'Prey, Berggren and Phillips do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the present invention found in amended claims 1 and 28. As claims 2-5 and 9-10 and 29-30 and 33-34 depend upon and include each and every limitation of amended claims 1 and 28, respectively, it is respectfully submitted the cited prior art do

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the dependent claims either. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey, Berggren and Phillips and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,125,281 to Wells et al. Applicants have cancelled claim 7 and therefore respectfully request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 20, 21, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey. For the reasons given above for the patentability of claim 16, upon which claims 20, 21, 25 and 26 depend, Applicants respectfully submit that O'Prey does not disclose teach or otherwise suggest the invention claimed. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of Wells. Applicants have cancelled claim 23 and therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of Phillips. Applicant has cancelled claim 19. For the reasons given above with respect to differences between the present invention and O'Prey and as Phillips does not provide any additional art to overcome the differences between the present invention and claim 16, upon which claim 17-18 depends, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to
50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Belkin, Anatoly S. et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

By: Simon B. Anolick.

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750